

**Minutes
City of Burlington Plan Commission
Police Dept. Courtroom
December 11, 2007 6:30 p.m.**

Mayor Lois called the Plan Commission meeting to order this Tuesday evening at 6:30 p.m. followed by roll call: Commissioners John Thate, Darrel Eisenhardt, Bob Henney Tom Vos, John Lynch, Bob Schulte and Town of Burlington Representative Phil Peterson. Also present were: Building Inspector / Zoning Administrator Patrick Scherrer, Aldermen Katie Simenson, Peter Girolamo, Bob Miller, Bob Prailes and Mr. Patrick Meehan, Meehan and Company, Inc.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Thate moved and Commissioner Vos seconded to approve the minutes of November 13, 2007 and the special meeting minutes of November 27, 2007. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Motion to receive petition for Springbrook Meadows – Commissioner Vos moved and Commissioner Thate seconded to accept and file the petition opposing the development of Springbrook Meadows. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Citizen Comments – Police Officer David Waltz, 1149 Hidden Creek, City of Burlington, stated that the comments that he had were not reflective of the Burlington Police Department. He stated that he was strongly opposed to the Springbrook Meadows project. He explained that his family was sold on a home in this neighborhood with the understanding that it would be surrounded by other similar single family homes, not condominiums or apartments. He also voiced his disappointment with the developer for misleading not only his family, but others in the neighborhood as well.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. A public hearing to consider a Conditional Use application from James Foti for property located at 80 McHenry Street for use as a used car dealership with detailing service.**

Mayor Lois opened the public hearing at 6:35 p.m.

There were no comments.

Commissioner Schulte moved and Commissioner Vos seconded to close the public hearing. All were in favor and the motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 6:35 p.m.

- B. A public hearing to consider a Conditional Use application from Haag Muller, Inc., on behalf of the McDonalds Corporation for property located at 316 N. Dodge Street for use as a restaurant.**

Mayor Lois opened the public hearing at 6:36 p.m.

There were no comments.

Commissioner Vos moved and Commissioner Henney seconded to close the public hearing. All were in favor and the motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 6:36 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Consideration to approve a Site Plan application and a Conditional Use Application from Stelling and Associates, on behalf of Love, Inc., for property located 442 S. Pine Street, Unit #7, to use as a retail store, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 4, 2007 memorandum and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission.**

Mayor Lois opened this issue for discussion.

Commissioner Vos questioned if this request is simply extending what Love, Inc. is currently doing. Mayor Lois stated that was correct.

Commissioner Vos moved and Commissioner Lynch seconded to approve a Site Plan application and a Conditional Use Application from Stelling and Associates, on behalf of Love, Inc., for property located 442 S. Pine Street, Unit #7, to use as a retail store, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 4, 2007 memorandum and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission as follows:

- If any new outdoor lighting is contemplated to serve the off-street parking lot, outdoor lighting data must be submitted which indicates the location, type, and illumination level (in footcandles) of all outdoor lighting proposed to illuminate the site. It is recommended that total cut-off luminaires be used throughout the site meeting the requirements of Sections 315-137(C)(25) of the City Zoning Ordinance.

All were in favor and the motion carried.

- 2. Consideration to approve a Site Plan application and a Conditional Use application from James Foti, for property located at 80 McHenry Street, for the use of used car sales and detailing, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 4, 2007 memorandum and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission.**

Mayor Lois opened this issue for discussion.

Mike Topczewski, Stelling and Associates, was present to answer any questions that the Commission had. Commissioner Thate questioned if this was the same owner requesting this Conditional Use as last year and if so would he be adhering better to the City's regulations regarding number of cars on the lot.

Mr. Topczewski stated that the owner's desire is to keep a full stock of vehicles for viewing and sales; however he would like to work with the Commission on a configuration regarding the parking stalls. Mayor Lois noted that Mr. Foti knew the lot size of the property when he bought it and he must follow the code like everyone else.

Building Inspector Patrick Scherrer stated that the original Conditional Use showed a layout of the cars and not a set number of cars. Mayor Lois suggested that Mr. Topczewski go back to the owner to discuss amending the plans to include handicap stalls, landscaping, etc.

Commissioner Lynch moved and Commissioner Henney seconded to deny the Site Plan application and a Conditional Use application from James Foti, for property located at 80 McHenry Street, for the use of used car sales and detailing.

All were in favor and the motion carried.

3. Consideration to approve A Site Plan application and a Conditional Use application from Haag Muller, Inc., on behalf of McDonald's Corporation, for property located at 316 Dodge Street, to rebuild McDonalds, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 4, 2007 memorandum and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission.

Mayor Lois opened this issue for discussion.

Mr. Steve Jeske, Haag Muller, Inc. and Mr. Gordy Massuchi, President Chief Operator Officer, were present at the meeting to discuss the plan. Mr. Jeske explained that the plan is to tear down the existing restaurant located at Dodge and Jefferson Street and purchasing the vacant gas station next door to build a brand new restaurant. He explained that the orientation of the building would be changing 90 degrees to face Jefferson Street and would include parking for 49 vehicles, more landscaping and additional greenspace. There would also be a "side by side" drive-thru which would allow for two order points to make the drive-thru much more efficient.

Mr. Jeske did question if the driveway that they are proposing on East Jefferson Street could be 35 feet wide instead of the zoning required 30 feet to accommodate for the turns in and out of the lot.

Commissioner Thate questioned if they were planning on raising the elevation of the site. Mr. Jeske stated that they would only be raising the elevation according to the zoning requirements (two feet above the floodplain level).

Mr. Meehan wanted to point out to the Commission that this proposal is in conflict with the Downtown Plan; however he does not see it posing a problem for the City in the future. Mayor Lois complimented the plans and the developer's efforts to update the site. Mayor Lois also noted that in the future they would have to work with the City and the Burlington Co-op regarding possibly vacating Washington Street.

Alderman Girolamo asked on a personal note if there would be a play land in the new building. Mr. Massuchi stated that the play lands are a thing of the past and are not installed in any new McDonalds.

Commissioner Henney questioned how the two lane drive-thru through works without creating a traffic flow problem. Mr. Jeske stated that it's a fine science that McDonald's has developed over the years that includes lane merging and the correct positioning of the lanes. Commissioner Henney also questioned if anything had been done with the storm sewer issue on Jefferson Street. Mayor Lois stated that when the Riverwalk was done a 36 inch main was installed there and the Fox River State Bank addressed their portion of it as well.

Commissioner Vos moved and Commissioner Thate seconded to approve a Site Plan application, Certified Survey Map and a Conditional Use application from Haag Muller, Inc., on behalf of McDonald's Corporation, for property located at 316 Dodge Street, to rebuild McDonalds, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 3 and 4, 2007 memorandums and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission as follows:

- 236.20 (h) "The centerline of streets of all streets" (per 236.34 (c)).
- 236.20 (k) "The main chords of the right of way lines shall be drawn as dashed or dots" (per 236.34 (c)).
- The "tie" distance to parcel is 133.17' on drawing and 1333.17' in description.
- The existing fuel tanks for the gas station are proposed to be removed. Have the tanks been closed and has a site assessment been completed for contamination? See the following website for tank closure information.
<http://www.commerce.state.wi.us/er/ER-BST-Closure.html>
- The erosion control standard note should reference the City of Burlington and Not the City of Milwaukee.
- The McDonalds proposes to close the south Entrance on N. Dodge Street and the entrance on Washington Street. The current northern exit along Dodge Street will be reconstructed and a new entrance/exit will be provided on Jefferson Street. This layout affectively removes four accesses points to public streets.
- The proposed building is considered redevelopment for the purposes of stormwater management. Applicability for storm water management practices follows Ordinance 270-5 of the Burlington Code. Their does not appear to be any additional impervious area from the site, runoff from the site will be reduced with the additional green space. *Permanent Storm water detention will not be required. **However NR 151.11 Requirements for Construction will still apply for a redevelopment site greater than 1 acre.*** This includes a obtaining a Notice of Intent Permit and complying

will all Requirements set forth in NR 151.11. Please supply us with a Notice of Internet Permit once it has been obtained.

- Provide existing and proposed flows to the manhole #1 located in Washington Street. Verification must be demonstrated that the existing sewer has the capacity to handle the additional flows to the system.
- Inlet protection is required on all proposed storm sewer inlet manholes until the site has been stabilized, per Detail "C" on sheet C 4.0.
- In the surveyor's certificate, please add after "WIS. STATS....." please remove the word "of" and add "and Chapter 278 of the City of Burlington Municipal Code,"
- Please review the Lot acreage (not a condition of approval).
- That the Plan Commission holds a public hearing on the proposed Conditional Use pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-130C of the City Zoning Ordinance.
- All of those drawings and materials submitted by the applicant
- The elevation of the lowest floor, excluding the basement or crawlway, must be at or above the flood protection elevation on fill. The fill must be two feet or more above the regional flood elevation extending at least 15feet beyond the limits of the structure. The Department may authorize other flood proofing measures if the elevations of existing streets or sewer lines makes compliance with the fill standards impractical.
- The basement or crawlway floor may be placed at the regional flood elevation if it is flood proofed to the flood protection elevation. No basement or crawlway floor is allowed below the regional flood elevation.
- Contiguous dry land access must be provided from a structure to land outside of the floodplain, except as provided in Subsection C(1)(d).
- In developments where existing street or sewer line elevations make compliance with Subsection C(1)(c) impractical, the City may permit new development and substantial improvements where access roads are at or below the regional flood elevation, if:
 - The City has written assurance from police, fire and emergency services that rescue and relief will be provided to the structure(s) by wheeled vehicles during a regional flood event; or
 - The City has a natural disaster plan approved by Wisconsin Emergency Management and the Department of Natural Resources. The City Engineer must determine if these requirements have been met by the proposed Site Plan submitted by the applicant.

- Copies of any approvals granted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and/or the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) relative to filling and/or modifying the existing 100-year recurrence interval floodplain must be provided to the City as such approvals are obtained by the applicant.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-49(B) of the City Zoning Ordinance, the maximum allowable driveway width in the B-2 District is 30 feet at the street line. The applicant proposes 35 feet for the Jefferson Street entryway and 24 feet at the N. Dodge Street entryway. Based upon the Site Plan submitted, this standard is not met for the proposed width of the Jefferson Street entryway. Section 315-49(B) of the City Zoning Ordinance provided, however, that these requirements may be revised for a particular use in any zoning district upon recommendation by the City Engineer and approval by the Plan Commission.
- Section 315-48(M) sets forth the minimum required width of off-street parking rows and aisles. Based upon that requirement, a single row and aisle of 60-degree parking spaces needs to be a minimum of 40 feet in width. The proposed Site Plan does not meet these requirements since the width of the single row of parking for the proposed 60-degree aisles is only 38 feet. Therefore, the Site Plan and all other associated drawings must be corrected accordingly and resubmitted to the City to indicate this change. [Note: It appears that adequate space is available on-site to accommodate this dimensional correction.]
- Sections 315-48(D)(6)(b) and 315-52(H)(12) of the City Zoning Ordinance require that all landscape plant materials planted as either parking lot landscaping or as required bufferyards meet or exceed the minimum plant material size standards set forth in Section 315-48(D)(6)(b) of the City Zoning Ordinance at time of installation. As currently presented on the submitted Landscape Plan, the trees proposed to be located within the required parking lot landscape areas (the "Pink Profusion Crab") are proposed to be only 1.5" caliper in size. The provisions of Section 315-48(D)(6)(b) of the City Zoning Ordinance require that these required four (4) canopy trees be a minimum size of 3-inch caliper at the time of installation. Therefore, a revised Landscape Plan must be submitted to the City staff for review for compliance with this requirement.
- A catalog page, cut sheet, or photograph of the luminaire including the mounting method, a graphic depiction of the luminaire lamp (or bulb) concealment, and graphic depiction of light cut-off angles. This data has not been submitted by the applicant and must be submitted to the City staff.
- A photometric data test report of the proposed luminaire graphically showing the lighting distribution in all angles vertically and horizontally around the luminaire. This data has not been submitted by the applicant and must be submitted to the City staff.

- A plot plan, drawn to a recognized engineering or architectural scale, indicating the location of the luminaire(s) proposed, mounting and/or installation height in feet, the overall illumination levels (in footcandles) and lighting uniformities on the site, and the illumination levels (in footcandles) at the property boundary lines must be submitted. This may be accomplished by means of an isolux curve or computer printout projecting the illumination levels.
- Exterior lighting in the B-2 District must be limited to total cut-off type luminaries (with angle greater than 90 degrees). The maximum permitted illumination must be two (2) footcandles (as measured at the property line). The maximum permitted luminaire height must be 28 feet as measured from surrounding grade to the bottom of the luminaire. While the maximum allowable footcandle level and luminaire heights have not been exceeded (based upon the data set forth on the "Lighting Plan", the proposed luminaires do not appear to be total cutoff types since they are proposed to be tilted at a 30-degree angle. Under the full-cut off provisions, tilting is not allowed. Therefore, the applicant must submit a revised "Lighting Plan" which uses total cut-off luminaries which are not tilted.
- The size (height, width, area, etc.) of all ground-mounted signs must be indicated on the Site Plan drawing and a revised Site Plan drawing submitted to City staff.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-137(C)(25) "Outdoor Lighting Data Required," the applicant must submit the data required under the provisions of Section 315-27(I) of the City Zoning Ordinance.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-64(D) of the City Zoning Ordinance, on-site directional signs cannot exceed three square feet in area. However, no such signage is indicated in the application. If such signs are installed, the requirements of Section 315-64(D) must be met.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-71(C) of the City Zoning Ordinance, the maximum total sign area of freestanding signs for a parcel such as the subject property in the B-2 District is 100 square feet.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-71(D) of the City Zoning Ordinance, the maximum total sign area for all wall, fascia, awning/canopy, marquee, and graphic signs for a parcel such as the subject property in the B-2 District is 1.30 square feet proportionally per 1 linear foot of exterior storefront wall width that fronts on a public street; however, no sign for any 1 exterior storefront which fronts upon any public street or no sign for any 1 tenant which fronts upon any public street shall exceed 200 square feet in area.
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 315-71(E) of the City Zoning Ordinance, the maximum height of a freestanding sign for a parcel such as the subject property in the B-2 District is 15 feet.

- It is the understanding of Meehan & Company, Inc. that the subject property consists of two (2) or more separate parcels of land. As such, in order to comply with the various dimensional requirements of the City Zoning Ordinance when the property is developed as a single parcel, the applicant must accomplish a land consolidation pursuant to the definition of a "Land Consolidation" under Section 315-140 of the City Zoning Ordinance as follows:
 - "LAND CONSOLIDATION — The combining of two or more separate existing parcels of land or existing lots, or portions thereof, through the act or process of the combination of tax key numbers, lot line adjustment, the exchange of property between abutting property owners, subdivision platting, certified survey map, or condominium platting. [Added 11-19-2002 by Ord. No. 1702(16)]"
- The applicant has submitted a Certified Survey Map which would accomplish this required land consolidation. Subsequent to the City's approval of the Certified Survey Map, it is recommended that the applicant provide written proof to the City of Burlington that such a land consolidation has taken place (that is, has been officially recorded at the office of the Racine County Register of Deeds) prior to the City's issuance of a Building Permit.
- A note which indicates the following must be added to the face of the proposed Certified Survey map and a revised Certified Survey Map submitted to the City:
- "ALL BUILDINGS TO BE RAZED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER WITHIN ONE (1) YEAR OF CSM APPROVAL BY THE CITY OR PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST"
- Pursuant to the requirements of Section 278-39(A)(5), existing and proposed contours must be indicated. However, since a detailed grading plan has been submitted for City Engineer review and approval, it is recommended that this requirement be waived by the Plan Commission pursuant to the requirements of Section 278-11 of the City Subdivision of Land Ordinance.
- That the Common Council approves the proposed Certified Survey Map to achieve land consolidation of the subject property.
- The submission to the City of a revised Certified Survey Map within 90 days of its conditional approval by the Common Council.

All were in favor and the motion carried.

4. Consideration to approve a General Development Plan, a Site Plan application, three (3) Certified Survey Maps, a Landscape Plan, and a Rezone application from CJ Engineering, LLC, on behalf of McWan Homes, LLC, for property located in the Springbrook Landing Subdivision to create condominiums, subject to Kapur and Associate's December 4, 2007 memorandum and Patrick Meehan's November 30, 2007 memorandum to the Plan Commission.

Mayor Lois excused himself from this item and asked Commissioner Vos to run the meeting for this issue.

Commissioner Vos opened this issue for discussion.

Mr. John Didier, owner and managing partner of Pinebrook Point and developer of this project, wanted to clarify with the Commission and the resident's of the area that this plan is a viable, quality alternative to what was originally presented.

Mr. Chris Jackson, CJ Engineering, gave a presentation explaining the project. He informed the Commission that the proposed project called *The Meadows at Pine Brook* would consist of 20 side by side ranch condominium buildings (40 units total). The units would range in size from 1,350 to 1,650 square feet. Mr. Jackson noted that they would be removing the cul de sac and extending Springbrook Drive out to Hwy 83. He explained that the open space that was noted on the Springbrook Landing plat would remain the same with no environmental impact occurring from this proposed development. Mr. Jackson further noted that this proposal would include quality buildings, landscaping design, and preservation of the natural prairie. He stated that they would also like to alter the sidewalks in order to keep the original trees in the area.

An architectural presentation was given by the developer that included that fact that they had researched and found that the City has a need for this type of condominium. It was again explained that these units would be two side by side ranch style condominiums that will look like the existing single family homes. It was noted that there would be a buffer between the single family residential development by installing a berm and trees. It was also noted that these units would be owner occupied, not rentals.

Mr. Didier wanted it noted for the record that these units would be for sale as condominiums and under no circumstances would ever be rentals.

Commissioner Lynch questioned if the fact that the units would not be rented could be made a part of the Condominium Agreement. Mr. Didier stated that the "no rental" language could be incorporated into the condominium agreement. Commissioner Lynch also questioned what the price range would be of the proposed condominiums. Mr. Didier stated that the units would be in the \$250,000 price range, which would keep with the values of the other condominiums and single family homes that surround it.

Commissioner Henney questioned if these units would be age restricted being that they are targeting an older audience. Both Mr. Didier and Mr. Jackson confirmed that the units would not be age restricted; rather he felt that they were more marketable to seniors and/or singles.

Alderman Girolamo questioned how the developer planned on stopping the renting of these units after the first sale. Mr. Didier and Mr. Jackson stated that stipulations for that would be included in the restricted covenants. Mr. Meehan stated that the City Attorney could ensure that a clause can be included in the condominium declaration that states that the declaration could not be changed as it is an integral part of the PUD, unless it comes back to the City as an amendment for that change.

Mr. Didier wanted to clarify that he wants quality properties surrounding his property (Springbrook Point) and that he empathized with the surrounding property owners regarding the change in the development of the subdivision.

The following residents were in attendance: Nicole Thomas, 1157 Hidden Creek Lane, City of Burlington; Joe & Ruth Dawidziak, 1165 Hidden Creek Lane, City of Burlington; David & Charise Lorentz, 1164 Hidden Creek Lane; Marie Way, 1016 Eastbrook Drive, City of Burlington; Christine Waltz, 1149 Hidden Creek Lane, City of Burlington; Ken France, 1200 Eastbrook Drive, City of Burlington.

The aforementioned mentioned residents voiced their concerns regarding the fact that this development is not what the residents of this subdivision were told would occur for the rest of the development. The residents also felt that this type of condominium development is not necessary in the City, nor would it benefit the existing subdivision or surrounding subdivisions. Questions were raised regarding who provided the data that showed that Burlington needed this kind of development. Several residents also voiced concern with the increase in traffic flow through an area surrounded by children. Concerns were also raised regarding what assurances there were if these condominiums weren't built that apartments or duplexes wouldn't replace them. Comments were also made regarding that fact that the residents felt as though this was not the subdivision ideal that they bought into when they purchased their homes. The vast majority of the residents of the Springbrook Landing Subdivision stated that they felt betrayed by the developer regarding his intentions and his future vision of the subdivision. They also expressed their disappointment and frustration that he was not present at this evenings meeting to give them any answers.

The developer explained that the original plan to build more single family homes was not working with the current market and demand in the City. This proposed plan was merely a viable option for the remaining land in the subdivision. Mr. Didier explained that he worked extensively with Shorewest Realty and other contacts to gain the data that showed the need for this type of development in the City. The developer reminded the surrounding residents that they purchased their properties knowing that they were going to be surrounded by Springbrook Condominiums and Pinebrook Point which are similar to this proposed development.

Alderman Girolamo spoke as the alderman for the district where this development lies, and stated that he does not recommend this subdivision be approved. He expressed his frustration regarding the fact that McWan (developers of Springbrook Landing Subdivision) has abandoned the very plans that they proclaimed was a "hot concept" when the subdivision was in the planning stages.

Mr. Didier explained further that these proposed condominiums would not bring in any more "rif-ra" than a single-family home could. He also noted that safety issues and property value hardships would not be any different than with the single-family homes.

Commissioner Schulte questioned if the Conservancy Subdivision residents were against the initial Springbrook Landing development. Mr. Ken France, resident of the Conservancy Subdivision stated that at first they were against the original development, but with the cooperation of the developer to conserve space for the Conservancy Subdivision, the residents were able to accept the incoming development.

Commissioner Lynch expressed his understanding of why people want condominiums and why the need is in the City. He explained that he was involved with the Plan Commission when the plans for the Springbrook Landing Subdivision were originally brought forward and saw how consistently the City looks into the land uses prior to homes being placed on the property. He was not completely sure why the residents were all objecting to it, but sympathized with the situation that they are in and not getting what they originally purchased.

Commissioner Eisenhardt voiced his concern regarding the fact that the City has created this island of unique type of homes in Springbrook Landing by considering adding condominiums that were not part of the original concept.

The developer wanted to reiterate that there are other condominiums and mixed uses in this area. It was explained that every neighborhood needs diversity and no matter what the circumstances will have an issue when there is change.

Alderman Bob Miller explained that when the Springbrook Landing Subdivision was originally proposed, it was brought forward as a conservancy neighborhood. He further explained that this concept may not be something that people want to buy into and may be why the remaining lots have not sold. He stated that by giving the lots more time to sell may not help if the concept is not appealing to the public.

Town of Burlington Representative Phil Peterson recalls the original concept and admits that he was skeptical of it at first, but after seeing the residents of the subdivision he can tell that they like the concept of the subdivision that they have. He also agreed with the developers of the proposed subdivision that condominiums of this type are needed in Burlington; however if he was a voting member of this board he would deny this proposal because it was not a part of the original concept proposed by the developer of Springbrook Landing.

Mr. Jackson requested that the Commission table this issue to allow the developer's to discuss the concerns raised, talk with the neighbors and come up with a revised plan.

Commissioner Thate voiced his disappointment that the Springbrook Landing developers were not present at this evenings meeting. He also felt that the residents of the subdivision should not be taking out their frustrations on developers of the new proposal. He stated that if this issue is tabled, the developer or some representative of the Springbrook Landing Subdivision should be present at the next meeting to discuss and explain why this change in direction is taking place.

Acting Chairman Vos stated that he would suggest tabling this issue and he would be voting present due to the fact that he has done work on several of the existing condominiums, as well as several of the homes in the subdivision.

The area residents were against tabling this issue because they felt that the developer should have been present to defend and explain his decisions to deviate from the original plans.

A roll call vote was taken to table this issue. Roll Call: Ayes: Schulte, Thate and Eisenhardt. Nays: Henney and Lynch. Acting Chairman Vos voted present. The majority was in favor and the motion to table this issue carried.

OTHER MATTERS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Thate moved and Commissioner Eisenhardt seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Adjourned at 8:15 p.m.
Recording Secretary – Angela M. Hansen